AHERNE

AM
1933
a
c.2

BC UNIVERSITY CHENERY LIBRARY
s for the Use of Ma

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

College of Liberal Arts
Library

Gift of

Author

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL

THESIS:

THE FUNCTIONING OF THE ELECTION PRIMARY IN THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

BY

RAYMOND J. AHERNE

(B. A. BOSTON UNIVERSITY--1932)

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

1933

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
LIBRARY

HEL

p 7432

378.744
BO
AM 1933
a
c.2

CONTENTS

Chapter Page

I------THE BACKGROUND AND EVOLUTIONARY HISTORY OF THE PRIMARY SYSTEM

A. Nominations in the Colonial Period 1-2

B. Revolutionary Period 2-3

C. Development of Convention System 3-6

D. State Nominations by Legislative Caucus 6-7

E. The Procedure of the Later Caucus 7-8

F. The State Conventions 8-12

II------THE REFORMS THAT LED TO THE DIRECT PRIMARY

A. Reforming of the Caucus System 13

B. Legislative Acts of Reform 13-14

C. The Experiment that Led to Reform and Demands for a Change 14-23

D. The End of the Old Caucus System in Sight 23-24

III------THE DIRECT PRIMARY AND ITS OPERATION

A. Nominations of Candidates 25-26

B. How Nominations are Made 26-27

C. Nominations and Elections at State Primaries 27-28

D. Secretary of State Must be Notified of Holding of Primaries 28

E. When the Polls Shall be Open 28

F. Nomination Papers and Number of Signatures 28

Chapter | Page

G. Nomination Papers, Contents, Qualifications of Signers, Acceptance, and Number of Candidates 28-29

H. Certificates and Limitation of Candidates 29-30

I. Preparation etc., and Last Day for filing 30

J. Nominations in Case of Death, Withdrawal, or Ineligibility 30-31

K. Vacancies Caused by Withdrawal and Time of Filing Objections 31

L. The Counting of Ballots 31

M. The Canvass and Returns of Votes 31-32

N. Vacancies Caused by Ties in Delegations or Committees and How These Vacancies are Filled 32

O. Objections to Nominations and Withdrawal of Nominees 33

P. State Conventions of Political Parties 33-34

Q. Examples of the Official Primary Ballot Used in Massachusetts 35-35A,B

IV------THE OPERATION OF THE PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY

A. Presidential Nomination by Legislative Resolution and by Elected Delegates 36-37

B. Preferential Voting 37-38

C. Party Enrollment 39

D. Objections to Uninstructed Delegates 39-40

E. Synopsis of Massachusetts' Presidential Primary Laws 40-41

V-------THE CHANGES THAT HAVE BEEN ADVOCATED FOR THE UMPROVEMENT OF THE DIRECT PRIMARY IN MASSACHUSETTS

Chapter Page

A. Recommendations for Reform of the Direct Primary in Massachusetts 42-44

B. Pre-primary Convention 44-50

C. Other Proposed Changes 50-51

VI------CONCLUSION

A. Importance of Primary 52-53

B. The Evils of the Primary System 53-56

C. The Special Merits of the Primaries 56-57

D. Summary 57-58

BIBLIOGRAPHY

INTRODUCTION

The State of Massachusetts' Primary system has had a colorful history of difficulties and intricacies in the attempt to get an efficient system by which the people may control the nomination as well as the election, without the undue influence of the "political boss".

In the following pages, it will be the aim of the writer to give a clear and authentic description of the functioning of the State Primary system in Massachusetts. The background and the evolution of the Massachusetts' nominating system will, of course, be touched upon, but the main emphasis will be on the present day working of the Primary system.

At times it will seem to the reader that certain points are unduly stressed, but the author must point out that the material on the nominating system of Massachusetts is not abundant and every fragment of pertinent material, obtained from both academic and research sources, has been used in an effort to make the description as complete as possible. Therefore, where there is more information on some points than on others, the former points become emphasized sometimes out of proportion.

The nominating system of Massachusetts, or of any state in fact, is not perfect. The writer will criticize from the point of view to which his research has brought him and

will quote criticisms, both good and bad, of authorities on the type of Primary system that is used in Massachusetts. The good points will be brought out, and the abuses emphasized with the necessary reforms to correct these abuses pointed out.

This work has been limited to the State Primary system because discussion of both State and local nominating systems in the same book would tend to confuse the reader, though at times the system of the city of Boston through necessity will be touched upon.

It is to be hoped that this little volume will give each reader a more complete and understanding knowledge of the State Primary system of Massachusetts.

Special acknowledgment is given to Miss Florence H. Luscomb, Secretary of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, at one time very much interested in the League of Women Voters, and to James H. Sheldon, Professor of Government at Boston University.

Miss Luscomb's kindness in allowing the author to use her private collection of material on the Primary and pre-convention Primary, in which she has had a great deal of interest, helped invaluably in writing upon the Primary election system of the last few years in Massachusetts.

Professor Sheldon through his patience, knowledge, and direction has made the completion of this work possible.

I extend to both my sincere thanks.

R. J. A.

Chapter I

THE BACKGROUND AND EVOLUTIONARY HISTORY OF THE PRIMARY SYSTEM

A. Nominations in the Colonial Period.

In an exposition of the functioning of the present day Primary system of Massachusetts, the background and evolutionary history of the nominating processes used must be related in order to obtain a more complete understanding of the immediate system.

In the colonial period we find that nominations were in some cases self-announced, but the common way was to make them at private conferences, or at what would be called "parlor caucusus" of those particularly interested in public affairs; i.e. by the leading men in the community. There were not any real, well-defined, and permanent political parties in the colonial period. There were, nevertheless, exciting political contests occuring, where we may be sure there existed some sort of an agreement upon candidates previous to election corresponding to the caucus or Primary of later times, and there even seems to have been an agreement extending through the different towns similarly to the modern State conventions. For instance, Dallinger in his book, "Nominations for Elective Office", speaks of it, saying, "In Massachusetts at the election in May, 1635, Haynes was elected governor over Ludlow who, as one of the Assistants, felt that he was entitled to the position. According to Governor Win-

throp, Ludlow protested against the election of governor as void, for that the deputies of the several towns had agreed upon the election before they came".[1]

These "parlor caucuses" or self-nominations were not the only nominating systems, for there was a system of official nomination. The freemen of the several towns met on a certain day and voted for twenty persons to be nominated for "Assistants" i.e., members of the Council or upper house of the Legislature. The vote of each town was then sent to Boston where the vote of the entire colony was counted in the presence of the two houses of the Legislature. A list of the names of twenty persons receiving the highest number of votes was sent to each town, and from this list of officially nominated candidates, each freeman voted for twelve at the regular election.[2]

B. Revolutionary Period.

During the period of the Revolution, we discover that patriotic clubs that had sprung up for the purpose of agitating for American Independence in many sections nominated the Whig candidates for the various elective offices. These clubs were generally known as "caucuses".

It will be well to give a description of this prototype of the later caucus, a Primary. The description is quoted from Dallinger's work mentioned above. Dallinger

---

1. Dallinger Nominations for Elective Office page 5
2. Dallinger Nominations for Elective Office page 8

says, "It (i.e., the word caucus) seems to mean a number of persons, whether more or less, met together to consult upon adapting and prosecuting some scheme of policy for carrying a favorite point. The word is not a novel invention. More than fifty years ago Mr. Samuel Adams' father and twenty others, one or two from the north end of the town, where all the ship business is carried on, used to meet, make a caucus, and lay their plans for introducing certain persons into places of trust and power. When they had settled it, they separated, and each used their particular influence within his own circle. He and his friends would furnish themselves with ballots including the names of the parties fixed upon which they distributed on the day of election. By acting in concert together with a careful and extensive distribution of ballots, they generally carried the electors to their own mind. In like manner it was that Mr. Samuel Adams first became a Representative for Boston.

C. Development of Convention System

Massachusetts during the Revolutionary period had taken the lead in political organization. In the years immediately following the adoption of the Constitution, she appears to have fallen behind the State of Pennsylvania in this respect. The lack of party organization is shown by the large number of candidates for each office, many of whom were put in nomination by a personal letter from some friend or admirer to the editor of some newspaper that was part of the

party machine. Dallinger cites an example of this peculiar and interesting form of nomination:

"To the Free Electors of the Three First Districts"

Fellow Citizens:- With a right idea of the delicacy of the measure, but with a sincere reliance on your candour, I beg the indulgence of mentioning the Honorable David Cobb, Exquire, as a candidate for your Representative in Congress for the three districts at large etc.

(Signed)

An Elector[3]

These letters were signed with various names, among which were the following: "A Farmer", "Whole Truth", "Fidelitas", "condidus", "Middlesex", "Union", "Freeman", etc. In content these letters sometimes went as far as to place in nomination a whole ticket of Congressmen and Presidential Electors.

In regard to the caucus convention nomination, it is interesting to notice that in October 1794, at a caucus of Republican voters of the Boston district, a Doctor Jarvis was nominated as the Republican candidate for Congress against Fisher Ames. Concerning which nomination, a Republican authority asserted that there were seven hundred voters present at the caucus while the Federalist papers said there were

---

3. Dallinger Nominations for Elective Office page 23
Note: Dallinger's work will be quoted often throughout this chapter because it is the only authoritative work on the subject of early systems of nomination.

not more than one hundred present and that the nomination was in reality made by the Boston Jacobin Club.[4] Here can be seen the real beginnings of inter-party-conflict.

In 1802, as far as can be ascertained, both the Federalist and Republican parties held congressional and county conventions in the different sections of the State, and from that time on the delegate convention appears to have been the prevailing method of nomination for all district offices. In the beginning, these conventions were customarily called by a vote of a caucus in some one city or town. The course of procedure being that an invitation was extended to the party voters of the other cities and towns in the district to send delegates to a convention to be held at some designated time and place. Gradually, there came the growth of party organization and subsequently, the call came to be issued to the district or town committee. It is very interesting to note that these committees, in some cases, have performed the function of nominating the party candidates. A good example of this method of nominating is found in the nomination of Benjamin Gorham, in 1820, as the Republican candidate for Congress from the Boston district by the Republican city committte, as at present composed of the members of the different ward committees. It must be said, however, in justification, that the nomination was later ratified by a "general caucus" of the party voters of the district.[5]

4. Dallinger Nominations for Elective Office page 24
5. Dallinger Nominations for Elective Office page 24

In these early conventions, it was common in Massachusetts as elsewhere to pass a vote that the proceedings of the convention be published in the leading party newspaper, signed by the Chairman and Secretary of the convention. The first recorded case in which the call for a convention prescribed the exact number of delegates to which each town was entitled in the convention was in 1808.[6] There also seems to have been some political manipulation in regard to "Snap Conventions" for in 1828 a complaint was made that the Middlesex County Convention was not properly advertised.[7]

D. State Nominations by Legislative Caucus

In regard to officers elected by the people of the State at large, viz; the governor and lieutenant-governor, the method of nomination underwent a curious development. During the years immediately following the adoption of the Constitution, candidates for governor were nominated at a meeting of party voters from the different parts of the State held in Boston. It was a sort of a State caucus or Primary. Owing to the difficulty and expenses of travelling in those days, the number of persons from distant parts of the State was necessarily small, and therefore the gathering was in reality a State convention composed of the political leaders in the different sections.

Why the above system of nominating candidates was

---

6. Dallinger Nominations for Elective Office page 25
7. Dallinger Nominations for Elective Office page 25

adopted can easily be seen, for the people were familiar with the convention in the forming of their State constitution, as well as in the ratification of the new Federal Constitution. The first period of the State convention was not of long duration. It was not long before the party members of the Legislature usurped the power of nominating the State ticket, and by 1800 the Legislative Caucus system was the method of nomination. This method of nomination was adopted because it was the easiest.

The nomination made by these Legislative Caucuses was usually ratified by district conventions and public meetings throughout the State, the ratification being in the form of an original nomination. There then came a reaction to the Legislative Caucus and it began to decline as a popular system of nomination from 1811 to 1835 with the subsequent coming in of the State convention.

E. <u>The Procedure of the Later Caucus.</u>

It might be well at this point to give a description of the caucus with regard to the town nominating system. A caucus is a town meeting of party voters. In Boston, no one is permitted to vote in a Republican caucus unless he is an "enrolled Republican", that is, unless his name has been entered upon the ward committee's list of Republican voters for the ward in which he resides.[8] The meeting is called to

---

8. Dallinger Nomination for Elective Office page 51

order by the person designated in the call, usually by the Chairman of the ward or town committee who reads a copy of the printed call. It is then the custom of the caucus to then elect a Chairman and a Secretary, usually by viva voce, nomination being made from the floor. Candidates are then put in nomination by their friends, and their merits are discussed in an open meeting. It will bear notice that this very valuable feature of the old New England caucus was rare indeed in other States. After the names and qualifications of the various candidates have been presented and after a committee is appointed to receive, sort, and count the ballots, the voting begins. It was required by law that the voting shall be by ballot is asked for by ten voters, in which case the official voting list, certified by the registrars of voters has to be used. No one was allowed to vote unless his name was on the list. The voters, after their names are checked on the list, pass between the ballot committee and deposit their ballots. The persons receiving the highest number of votes in the first ballot were by an almost invariable custom declared to be elected or nominated, as the case may be. If there were not any opposition, it was the usual custom to do the nomination by acclamation unless the party laws required a ballot; if so, the Secretary by a vote is directed to cast one ballot for the candidate nominated.

F. State Conventions.

In the case of State Conventions, the call was

issued by the State Central Committee. A printer's copy was sent to the Chairman of each city or town committee, and of each county committee in the State. This call stated the time and place of meeting of the convention, and also the number of delegates to which each city, town, or county is entitled. Each town and ward of a city was entitled to one delegate and to one additional delegate for every fifty votes or fraction thereof, cast for the Republican Convention of 1893.

The nominating procedure of the State convention was in the following manner. A motion was made and carried for the appointment by the Chairman of a committee to take charge of the balloting and to count the ballots after they had been cast. Thereupon the President gravely announced that "the chair will appoint the following committee", and proceeded to read off a list of names agreed upon by the State committee weeks before. He then declared that "nominations for the office of governor are now in order"; whereupon, nominating speeches in behalf of the leading candidates were usually made by men high up in the council of the party. Dallinger says that at the Republican Convention in Massachusetts in 1893, there was witnessed the remarkable spectacle of a candidate being placed in nomination by his two rivals for the nomination.[9]

---

9. Dallinger Nominations for Elective Office page 65

Where there is more than one candidate for nomination, a ballot is taken. When a candidate has received the majority of votes it is customary for friends of defeated candidates to move for unanimous nomination. The party holding the State government naturally renominate the incumbents of the various offices. When the governor and lieutenant-governor have been nominated, a committee waits upon them to inform them of their nomination and to escors the nominee to the hall. Committee appears on the platform with the Governor and Lieutenant-governor respectively, who are then introduced with the optimistic title of the next Governor and Lieutenant-governor respectively, and the nominees in turn respond with a short speech which in content pledges them to the party platform and extends thanks to the convention.

The nominees for the Massachusetts Executive council were nominated in a somewhat different convention. The State is divided into seven districts, each of which returns one councillor annually. The nominations for the Executive council were made by councillor conventions, composed of delegates from various cities and towns of the councillor district.

Nominations for the State Legislature were made in the case of the State Senate by Senatorial conventions and in the case of Representatives by a later caucus. The Senatorial convention was composed of delegates choosen at

caucuses of the party voters in the cities and towns situated in the particular district. Such conventions were called by the Senatorial district committee. Previous to the passage of the Caucus Act of 1894, it was the custom for delegates to the various conventions, together with the members of the ward or town committee, to be chosen at one and the same caucus, while candidates for the House of Representatives were nominated at a subsequent caucus called for that particular purpose. In 1894, for the first time in the case of the Republican party everything was done at a single caucus.

The various nominating schemes have been surveyed from the colonial times to the latter part of the nineteenth century. It can be easily seen that on the whole the nominating was in the hands of a few people. There came, however, the reaction against these methods. The people began to demand more of a chance to have a say in regard to the nominations. The voters were beginning to realize that nomination in some cases was paramount to election. Heretofore, the citizens were merely able to choose between the hand-picked candidates of the politically select.

With the reaction came the desire for reforms. The main essence of these reforms was that the people should, as far as practicable, nominate their candidates themselves, and not delegate that duty to conventions.

These various reform measures will be dealt with more

completely in a succeeding chapter, as these reaction reforms were the precursors of the need of the Direct Primary system such as is used today.

It is sufficient to say as a resume of this chapter that the country had grown too large and the people had become too politically awakened for "small-town" methods to continue.

Chapter II

THE REFORMS THAT LED TO THE DIRECT PRIMARY

A. Reforming of the Caucus System.

As was said in the preceding chapter, reforms were being demanded in order to do away with some of the abuses and evils of the caucus system. It was felt by the majority of voters that the State should throw about the nominations all the safeguards it throws about the election. The nomination was now nearing its true level of importance.

The first real effort made along the line of correction of the defects of the caucus system was the act of 1888, which was passed with the Australian ballot act.[1] The insistence of the political parties upon their rights to manage their own affairs resulted in the limitation of the act to a few simple provisions. It was, in fact, throughout the entire State until the passage of the act of 1894, after which enactment the 1888 act applied only to minor parties casting less than 3% of the votes last cast for governor.

B. Legislative Acts of Reform.

The adoption of the Australian ballot system, in which the government had to print all the ballots, gave to the political parties their first legal recognition. There must be a method of determining what names were to appear upon the ballot, and under what party designation; in short,

---

1. Session Laws of Massachusetts 1888 page 516

a legal definition of a party. Merriam and Overacker make the following interesting observation on the above legislation. "The conspicuous feature of this Primary legislation was the gradual approach toward the system employed in the general election". [2]

The next step in the reform movement was the Act of 1894, amended in 1895 and again in 1896. The act provided that no one was to be debarred from the Primary because he supported an independent candidate, and also that all party Primaries were to be held on one of two consecutive days fixed by the party committee; but forbade the holding of the Primaries of the two parties on the same day. It made provision for the election of various party committees in the party Primary.

C. The Experiment that led to Reform and Demands for Change

The question may be asked as to what was the particular motivating force that caused these reforms. The answer is that it was a successful experimentation that led to reform in Massachusetts. In 1889, a Republican ward of Boston tried the scheme of a secret Australian ballot containing the names of those candidates who had to be presented through properly filed nomination papers which had been signed by at least ten voters of the party. It was signally successful, and early in 1890 the Republican city committee extended it to the entire city. The results were again gratifying to

---

2. Merriam and Overacker Primary Elections page 23

the extent that an effort was made on the part of the Democratic party to adopt the same rules.[3] The failure of the attempt led to the combined agitation of both parties for caucus reform through legislative enactment. Through the work of both parties, there came into being the act of 1894. The Act of 1894 was divided into two separate acts, one embracing the entire State, and the other specially formed for Boston.

The following provisions did not apply to Boston: notices of the call must be issued seven days before the caucus must state the place, day, and hour of holding, which shall not be later than eight o'clock in the evening, notice must be posted in five places on lines of public travel, in every postoffice if practicable, and published in one or more local papers if any such are published, notice must specify how the caucus shall organize, that a ballot for the choice of delegates, candidates, etc. shall be taken and the polls kept open for at least thirty minutes. As a precaution against fraudulent counting, the secretary of the caucus is obliged upon written request of the qualified voters, to keep the voting list and ballots and to produce them if called for by any court of justice.

As the provisions in regard to Boston have no bearing upon the subject in hand, they shall be dispensed with. The amendment of 1896 was also related to city and town elections and will be left out of consideration.

3. Meyer Nominating Systems page 104

The law was silent upon the matter of enrollment and of party legislation. Grave abuses soon developed, and in 1897 an amendment was passed providing that if a challenged person made oath as to his identity, that he had not taken part in the caucuses of any party for a year, and that he intended to support the nominees of the caucus, he was permitted to vote. This method prevented the unjust exclusion of some, but permitted the unfair intrusion of others, for to some men an oath offers no barriers.

Meyer, speaking of the laws of 1894, 1895, 1896, and 1897, makes the following pithy statement: "The immediate result of the law was good, although it applied the direct vote principle only to the choice of direct ward officers and delegates to the convention and showed that there would be widespread application of the direct nomination.[4]

While Meyer's observation is no doubt authoritative, the real source of public opinion would come from the newspapers of the day. Excerpts from the Boston dailies will be considered just in order to get the trend of feeling in the largest city and capital of the State.

The Boston Record says: "The experiment made under the direct voting ordered by the Republican legislative has been so successful that it will be carried a good deal farther within the next two or three years. The fact that the Democrats have endorsed it in their platform will not do it any

---

4. Meyer Nominating Systems page 106

harm." The last statement is an interesting observation in view of the part political newspapers play in maligning the opposing parties today.

The Boston Post, not to be outdone, states that: "The Caucus has steadily increased in importance....until today it stands the equal of the election itself. Why then should not the caucus be made an election--an election of candidates--and conducted on the same simple plan and with the same sufficient safeguards as the final choice."

This opinion bears out the result of the study of the nominating systems as far as this work has progressed. Thus, both the work and the opinion substantiate each other in turn.

The Boston Herald remarks that: "We are pleased to note that an earnest effort is to be made to amend the caucus laws of this State so as to bring about direct nomination by the people. It is the coming reform in party management, the only sure way yet discovered for depriving the 'boss' and his machine of preponderating influence in 'nominations'".

There was excellent foresight on the part of the writer of this opinion even though the observation is somewhat optimistic in regard to the advantages of the Direct Primary.

Another leading Boston daily, the Globe, adds its advocation to the direct nomination by the following words:

"It cannot be again said that legislation of this description greatly interests the people. They are sick of intimidation, repeating bribery of delegates, false counts, and a hundred electioneering evils, and will welcome all efforts to secure honest elections. The absence of voters from the Primaries today is one of the greatest evils of the time."

There is no need for comment on this excerpt; it speaks for itself.

The Boston Traveler says: "In this State, so far as we have gone, direct nominations have given good results, and it is beginning to be understood that conventions are unnatural and useless barriers between the public will and public servants. The people can certainly be trusted to make their own nominations to the last extent. To make politics pure, every possible filtration of the public will must be avoided." The newspaper adds another push to the already rolling ball of a need for direct nomination of all State officers.

The Boston Advertiser adds: "No plan of caucus reform that has been brought forward within recent years has come so quickly into public favor and has been so generally accepted and so little criticised by the press throughout the State" (as some plan for direct voting).

The Boston Journal continues: "The adoption of this system (direct nomination) would do away with some of the

of the worst of the prevailing political abuses. It would impart to the Primary much of the same interest now taken in elections, and it is probable that a large proportion of the registered voters would participate in them. It would do away with private tricks and bargains, and would offer inducements for the best men to present themselves as candidates. If there are any disadvantages sufficient to offset these manifest gains, they are yet to be addressed". This statement advocates the direct nomination in such a way as to make the adoption paramount to the continuance of good government and this adds an important step in the education of the people towards the Direct Primary.

The Boston Transcript remarks: "After the demonstration we have recently had of the wisdom and practicalness of the (direct nomination) law of 1901 in Suffolk County, the Legislature cannot logically refuse to grant an extension of the reform to other and all parts of the Commonwealth. The bill which Mr. Luce of Somerville has introduced in the House is in effect, but the extension of a principle which has proved its correctness in theory and its utility in practice in a limited area. The Legislature has committed itself in favor of the principle, and it cannot consistently refuse to continue to favor it. No legislator who has any respect for the wishes of his constituents, or who has any fear of what they may do to him if he does not respect their wishes, will

think it prudent to oppose the direct nomination bill".

The Boston dailies have been quoted, and now with regard to the feeling of the rest of the State, some of the more important dailies outside of Boston will be scanned.

The Lawrence Eagle: "There is at present a widespread movement throughout the State in favor of the district system of nominations."

The Sreingfield Republican: "It marks the spread of a generalterdency back from representative government to a pure democracy where all the people participate not only in election but in nominations".

The Lowell Sun: "It is designed to make the nominations more the choice of the people than the selections of the politicians".

These excerpts show that the entire State was in accordance with the Boston dailies. The weeklies also had something to say concerning direct nomination.

Somerville Citizen: "The substitution of the Primary election would be a big improvement."

Boston Courier: "The nominating caucus is often more important than the voting on election day, and it should be guarded against fraud with at least equal care."

Boston Beacon: "It is incredible that a State like Massachusetts should lay behind in the reform, and it is sincerely to be hoped that the General Court will take positive action on the subject." [5]

5. Primary Elections and Direct Nominations panphlet put out by Caucus Reform League--all exceppts from newspapers are quoted from pages 4-10

There cannot be any doubt that the people, if the newspapers can be taken as a voice of their opinions, wanted the direct nomination system. The sincere desire voiced for an immediate enactment of a state-wide Direct Primary was doomed for a temporary disappointment, for it was not until 1911 that Massachusetts finally adopted the direct nomination system.

The old party leaders were diehards, but Josiah Quincy, Mayor of Boston, had voiced their doom as far back as 1890. Speaking before the National Conference on the Practical Reform of Primary Elections, he said, "The regulation of the caucus, the introduction of a formal system of balloting in it, does tend to increase the public interest in voting at a Primary election and does bring out a much larger vote.....it is a demonstrated fact in the City of Boston.....When the citizen is given some inducement to come out and vote at the party caucus...he shows the same interest in coming out and voting that he does upon election day." [6] The greatest indictment of the caucus convention system was given in the petition for the passage of House bill 264 in 1902. The prevalent method of nominating candidates for public office in Massachusetts was defective in these regards: "They discourage attendance at the Primaries by permitting them to be held at inconvenient times and places, often under conditions repulsive to many citizens.

---

6. National Conference on Practical Reform of Primary Elections Pamphlet

They discourage that fair and free rivalry which brings the people the widest range of choice, minimizing public interest by warranting the belief that the program has been pre-arranged and that the attitude of the individual voters will be in-effective and his attendance useless.

They permit candidates of one party to share in naming the candidates of another.

They facilitate the proceedings known as "caucus packing" and "repeating".

They have reached the point, as shown by recent happenings, of breeding scandal, corruption, conspiracy, and crime.

They give opportunity for exercising in conventions bribery, trading, intimidation, and fraud.

They make it rare for candidates to succeed, particularly in contested convention without truckling or putting themselves under obligations to cliques, rings, corporations or individuals, who seek to influence political action for personal advantage.

They foster intrigue, bossism, manipulation, and all the worst forms of political activity.

They frequently result in the nomination of candidates not the choice of a plurality of the pary members of a district.

They hinder the expression of the people's will, and are of value only to those who seek to nullify that will."[7]

7. Primary Elections and Direct Nominations League page 23 Caucus Reform

This indictment was strenuously backed up by Hofer, writing on the American Primary system. Hofer points out that "the corrupted Primary is the political crime of the country",[8] and also the "purification of the Primary unit of our politics is absolutely necessary if we would not see our country go down in the worst quagmire of corruption that ever swallowed a republic. We are living in an era of darkest bossism, when the sun of free self-government by the people has nearly set".[9]

D. The End of the Old Caucus System in Sight.

With such expressions of opinion against the time-dishonored caucus system, the change to a system more suitable to a democratic people, that is, a system by which the people might pick their own candidate, was inevitable. The Direct Primary, extended state-wide, seemed to be the solution but progress was slow, too slow for the adherents of the direct nominating method. Finally, the people were given their just right to select their own candidates by a complete law, putting in the Direct Primary system in 1911.

We shall speak of the Direct Primary and its workings in the next chapter. Suffice to say of the material in this chapter that the non-regulated caucus governed by a few men had failed of popular support and the combination of public opinion and press was too powerful to be withheld from

---

8. The School of Politics The American Primary page 7 Hofer
9. The School of Politics The American Primary page 16 Hofer

reform and a change to a system more in accordance with the ideals of the Massachusetts voters.

Chapter III

THE DIRECT PRIMARY AND ITS OPERATION

The Direct Primary in Massachusetts was installed by a complete law in 1911. There has also been subsequent legislation to correct evils and abuses that have arisen. The question whether the Direct Primary is a better system than the old convention system will not be discussed in this chapter, but will be taken care of in another one. The operation of the Direct Primary will be dealt with exclusively herein; the legislation on the system give; and samples of Primary ballots shown.

Hofer says, "In the perfected Primary every member of every party should have a direct vote in the choice of every candidate whose name appears on the ticket of his party."[1] With this quotation, the legislation of Massachusetts seems to be in accord. The subject of this work being limited to Massachusetts, the most desirable thing to do is to quote the laws on Primary elections, verbatim rather than by excerpts in order that nothing will be missed, and the operating of the Primary better understood.[2]

A. Nominations of Candidates.

What parties may make nominations?

At any Primary, caucus or convention held

---

1. Hofer The School of Politics. The American Primary Preface
2. These laws are quoted from the General Laws of Mass. 1932 Chapter 53, 1-4

under this chapter, each party having the right to participate in or hold the same, may nominate as many candidates for each office for which it has the right to make nominations therein as there are persons to be elected to that office, and no more. A party which has not polled at the preceding State or municipal election the vote required to make it a political or municipal party as defined in Section 1 of Chapter 50 [3]

> which at these preceding biennial elections has polled in the Commonwealth or in any district, county, city, town, or ward respectively, a number of votes for governor equal to the number of votes required to nominate, by nomination papers, a candidate for an office which is to be filled by election therein may hold a caucus of convention and make a nomination for the office so to be filled. A party which makes one or more nominations shall be entitled to have the name of each of its candidates printed on the ballot to be used at the ensuing election; but unless the nomination is made by direct plurality vote in a Primary or in several caucuses held in more than one ward or in more than one precinct or group of precincts, a certificate of nomination must be filed as provided in Section 5.

B. How Nominations are Made.

Section 2

> Except in the case of municipal nominations where city or town charters otherwise provided, candidates of political parties for all election offices except presidential elector shall be nominated, and members of political committees and delegates to conventions shall be elected in Primaries or by holding of the caucuses, and the nomination of any party other than a political party in

3. Political party shall apply to a party which at the preceding biennial State election polled for the governor at least three per cent of the entire vote casted in the commonwealth for that office

any district containing more than one ward or town chosen by caucuses held under Section 117 [4] in wards and towns of the district for which the nomination is to be made. All nominations and elections in Primaries and caucuses shall be by direct plurality vote. No candidate shall be nominated or political committee or convention delegates elected in any other manner than is herein provided.

Section 3

That a candidate whose name is not printed on the Primary ballot must accept nomination to have name printed on election ballot by filing a written acceptance of the nomination in the office of the State Secretary before the last hour for filing certificates of nomination for such office.

Section 4

No convention to nominate candidate shall be called for or held on a date earlier than four days after the holding of the caucus [5] for the choice of delegates thereto, and all such conventions shall be called for and held on a date not later than forty-eight hours prior to the hour for filing certificates of nominations provided in Section 10.[6]

The above laws have mainly applied to political parties and their relations to nominations. The laws following relate to State Primaries. The provisions applying to State Primaries are as follows:

C. <u>Nominations and Elections at State Primaries</u>.

Section 41

Primaries shall be held for the nominations for candidates of political parties for all iffices to be filled at a State election except presidential elector, and for the election of district

4. Twenty-five voters must participate and vote therein if the proceedings are to be valid.
5. General Laws Chapter 50 Section 1 The term "caucus" means any public meeting of the voters of a precinct, ward, or town held under the laws relating to caucuses.
6. These laws and following laws are compiled from the laws of 1909, pp.103,207,329; Laws 1910, pp.30,468; Laws 1911, pp. 570; Laws 1912, pp.173,180,184,336,374,411,694; Laws 1913, pp.950,628; Laws 1914,pp.403,959; Laws 1919, pp.200; Laws 1920,pp.497,592; Laws 1921,pp.246,460; Laws 1922,1926,pp.116; Laws 1927,pp.16,17,81,350.

members of state committees and delegates to State conventions of political parties.

Sections 42 to 54 inclusive shall apply to such Primaries

D. Secretary of State must be Notified of Holding of Primaries.

Section 42

In cities or towns where the aldermen or selectmen determine the questions of holding Primaries by wards, precincts, or groups of precincts, they shall give notice of their determination to the State Secretary on or before August first; except that in case of Primaries before special elections, they shall give such notice at least fourteen days before the Primaries.

E. When the Polls Shall Be Open.

Section 43

The polls at every State Primary shall be open during such hours, not less than nine in cities and two in towns as may be designated by the aldermen in the cities, and in towns by by-law or in default of such by-law or vote by the selectmen.

F. Nomination Papers and Number of Signatures.

Section 44

The nomination of candidates for nomination or election at State Primary shall be by nomination papers. In case of offices to be filled by all the voters of the commonwealth, such papers shall be signed in the aggregate by at least one thousand voters, not more than two hundred and fifty to be from any one county. Such papers for all other offices to be filled at a State election, and for members of committees and delegates to the State convention, shall be signed by a number of voters equal in the aggregate to five voters for each ward or town or town in the district or county, but in no case shall more than two hundred and fifty be required.

G. Nomination Papers: Contents, Qualification of Signers, Acceptance, Number of Candidates.

Section 45

Every nomination paper shall state in addition to the name of the candidate (1) his residence with street and number thereof, if any; (2) the office for which he is nominated; (3) the political party whose nomination he seeks and, except for candidate for ward and town committees and delegates to conventions, the paper may state in not more than eight words the public offices which he holds or has held, and if he is an elected incumbent of an office for which he seeks nomination, that he is a candidate for such renomination. Signatures shall be subjected to Section 7 [7] and every voter may sign as many nomination papers for each office as there are persons to be nominated for or elected thereto, and no more. No nomination paper shall contain the name of more than one candidate except in the case of delegates to the State convention and members of ward and town committee.

H. Certification and Limitation of Candidates.

Section 46

Every nomination paper shall be submitted on or before five o'clock in the afternoon of the Friday preceding the day on which it must be filed, to the registrars of the city or town in which the signers appear to be voters who shall check each name to be certified by them on the nomination paper and shall forthwith certify thereon the number of signatures so checked which are names of voters both in the city or town and in the district for which the nomination is made, and who are not enrolled in any other party than that whose nomination the candidate seeks, and only names so checked shall be deemed to be names of qualified voters for the purpose of nomination.

The provisions of Section 7 [8] relative to the

7. Section 7 reads as follows: Every voter signing a nomination paper shall sign in person with his name as registered, and shall state his residence on April 1 preceding and the place where he is then living, with the street and number if any; but any voter who is prevented by physical disability from writing or who had the right to vote on May 1,1857 may authorize some person to write his name and residence in his presence.
8. The registrars need not certify a greater number of names than are required to make a nomination increased by one fifth thereof. Names not certified in the first instance shall not thereafter be certified on the same nomination papers.

number of names to be certified and received, and to names not certified in the first instant shall apply to such papers.

For the purpose of certifying the names on Primary nomination papers, the registrars shall hold meetings on the fourth Friday next preceding the date on which such papers are required to be filed with the State Secretary, except that for Primaries before special elections, the meetings shall be held on the two Fridays next preceding such date.

No person shall be a candidate for nomination for more than one office; but this shall not apply to candidates for membership in political committees or delegations to the State convention.

I. Preparation, etc. and Last Day for Filing.

Section 47

Nomination papers for use in the nomination of candidates to be voted for at State Primaries shall be prepared and on request furnished by the State Secretary.

Section 48

All nomination papers of candidates to be voted for at State Primaries shall be filed with the State Secretary on or before the fifth Tuesday preceding the day of the Primaries, except in the case of Primaries before special elections when nomination papers shall be filed on or before the second Tuesday preceding the day of the Primaries.

J. Nomination in Case of Death, Withdrawal, or Ineligibility.

Section 49

If a person nominated to be voted for at a State Primary dies before the day of the Primary, or withdraws his name from nomination, or if found to be ineligible, and there is no other candidate for the party nomination for office, the vacancy may be filled by the State committee if the candidate is one to be voted for by all the

voters of the commonwealth; and in the case of candidates for nomination or election in a district by the members of the ward and town committee in the wards and towns comprising the district.

K. Vacancies Caused by Withdrawal and Time for Filing Objections.

Section 50

In cases of withdrawal, nominations to fill vacancies shall be filed with Secretary of State within seventy-two week days succeeding five o'clock in the afternoon of the last day for filing withdrawals.

They shall be open to objections in the same manner, so far as practicable, as other nominations.

No vacancy caused by withdrawal shall be filled before the withdrawal has been filed.

L. The Counting of Ballots.

Section 51

The provisions of Section 105 authorizing the opening of the ballot box at elections in towns, the taking therefrom of the ballots and counting thereof, prior to the closing of the polls, shall apply to State Primaries in towns. No ballots cast at a State Primary in cities shall be counted until the close of the polls.

M. The Canvass and Returns of Votes.

Section 52

Upon the receipt of the records of votes cast at State Primaries, the city or town clerk shall forthwith canvass the same and within four days after said Primary make return of the votes for candidates for nomination for State offices, and for election as members of the State committee, to the State Secretary who shall forthwith canvass such returns, determine the results thereof, notify the successful candidates, and certify to the State committee the names of persons nominated for State offices and elected as members of State committees. Said clerks shall determine the re-

sults of the vote for delegates to state conventions and members of ward and town committees, issue proper certificates, and notify the chairman of the city and town committees of the respective parties.

N. Vacancies Caused by Ties, or in Delegations or Committees and How These Vacancies Are Filled.

Section 53

In case of a tie vote where the number of persons receiving equal votes exceed the number of nominations available there shall be deemed a vacancy. If the tie is between candidates for an office to be filled by all the voters of the commonwealth, the vacancy shall be filled by the State committee. If the tie is between candidates for nominations for any other office, the vacancy shall be filled by the members of the ward and town committees in the district for which the nomination is to be made. If there is a tie vote for delegates to a convention, or a place unfilled in a delegation, or a vacancy occasioned by the inability or neglect of a delegate elected to attend a convention, such vacancy shall be filled only by vote of the remaining members of the delegation at a meeting therefor. Such a meeting shall choose a chairman and secretary, and the secretary shall notify the secretary of the convention of the action taken relative to the vacancy, except that if only one delegate or two delegates were to be elected, the the delegate or remaining delegates, as the case may be, shall fill the vacancy and notify the secretary of the convention of that action.

If there is a tie for members of a ward or town committee, the members elected shall fill the vacancy.

If a majority of a delegation, or of a ward or town committee, is not elected the vacancy shall be filled by the persons elected to the ward or town committee.

All vacancies caused by ties shall be filled only by the choice of one of the candidates receiving the tie vote.

O. Objections to Nominations and Withdrawals of Nominees.

Section 53A

> When nominations at the State Primary are in apparent conformity with law, they shall be valid unless written objections thereto are filed with the State Secretary within six days succeeding five o'clock in the afternoon of the day of holding such Primaries; and such objections and all other questions relating thereto shall be subject to section 12 [9] so far as applicable. A person nominated at such Primaries may withdraw and duly acknowledged by him and filed with the State Secretary within the limit prescribed in this section for filing objections to such nominations.

P. State Conventions of Political Parties.

Section 54

> A political party may upon the call of its State committee, but not earlier than one week nor later than two weeks after the holding of the Primaries, hold a State convention for the purpose of adopting a platform electing such number of members at-large of the State committee as may be fixed by it, nominating presidential electors, and for such other purposed consistent with law as the State committee or convention may determine. Such conventions shall consist of the delegates elected at the State Primary, the members of the State committee, the United States Senators from Massachusetts who are members of the party, the nominees of the party for all offices to be filled at the State election, and in years in which no elections are to be held for such offices, the incumbent of those offices who are members of the party.

The above laws cited are the complete election laws pertaining to State Primaries as compiled in 1932. The laws seem to have covered everything and left no loophole for abuse, but nevertheless there are some people who wanted

---

9. Objections (Section 12) to nominates for State offices, and all other questions relating thereto, shall be considered b the State Ballot Law Commission.

changes in the system. The changes desired will be viewed in a later chapter.

A synopsis of the Primary election laws will help the reader at this point:

Offices governed by the Direct Primary.

The Direct Primary applies to all elective offices except in cities whose charters provide otherwise, and except presidential electors.

Time: State Primary:-seventh Tuesday prior to general election.

The Primary is closed: i.e. Party voters determined by party enrollment.

Placing Names on the Ballot: By petition of 1,000 voters for statewide offices for the other offices of the State and city elections by three per cent cast for gove nor at last State election in political unit, but in no case less than 50 or more than 1,000; by writing names on ballot also.

Order of Names on Ballot: Alphabetically (except candidates for ward or town committee and convention delegates determined by law).

Vote Necessary to Nominate--Plurality Party Platform: May be adopted by a convention of elected delegates, the State committee, United States Senators, nominees for State officers, or in the

years when no election is held for State officers by the incumbents of those offices who are members of the party.

The Direct Primary system with its relation to State offices will for a time be left in abeyance while the next chapter takes up another Primary, the Presidential Primary, but chapter five will reserve the discussion to the Direct Primary.

Q. Examples of the Official Primary Ballot Used in Massachusetts.

The examples of Primary ballots used in Massachusetts were obtained through the courtesy of the Election Division at the State Capitol.

These examples are shown on the following pages, 35A and 35B.

5

STATE PRIMARY

OFFICIAL BALLOT

OF THE

REPUBLICAN PARTY

CHELSEA

Ward 4

Precinct 1

Tuesday, September 20, 1932

Frederic W. Cook

SECRETARY OF THE COMMONWEALTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS

COPY

OFFICIAL BALLOT OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

TO VOTE FOR A PERSON MARK A CROSS |X| IN THE SQUARE AT THE RIGHT OF THE NAME.

GOVERNOR . . . . . Vote for ONE

- **WALTER E. BROWNELL** OF 130 HUNTINGTON AVENUE, BOSTON
- **FRANK A. GOODWIN** OF 17 WADE STREET, BOSTON
  Former Registrar of Motor Vehicles
- **E. MARK SULLIVAN** OF 25 WILLIAM JACKSON AVENUE, BOSTON
- **WILLIAM STERLING YOUNGMAN** OF 39 WILLISTON ROAD, BROOKLINE
  Present Lieutenant Governor, Veteran, Former State Treasurer, Legislator

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR . . . Vote for ONE

- **GASPAR G. BACON** OF 222 PRINCE STREET, BOSTON
  President of Massachusetts Senate 1929-1932
- **CHESTER I. CAMPBELL** OF 210 NORFOLK STREET, QUINCY
  Former Mayor Quincy, Member Governor's Council Three Terms

SECRETARY . . . . . Vote for ONE

- **FREDERIC W. COOK** OF 75 BENTON ROAD, SOMERVILLE
  Present Secretary. For Renomination

TREASURER . . . . . Vote for ONE

- **FRANCIS PRESCOTT** OF OLD UPTON ROAD, GRAFTON
  Former Representative, Senator
- **MAX ULIN** OF 166 HARVARD STREET, BOSTON
  Present State Senator

AUDITOR . . . . . Vote for ONE

- **EMERSON JOHNSON COLDWELL** OF 68 BAY VIEW STREET, WEYMOUTH
  Somerville Alderman, Mass. House of Representatives 4 Years
- **ALONZO B. COOK** OF 43 BOWDOIN STREET, BOSTON
  State Auditor 16 Years

ATTORNEY GENERAL . . . . Vote for ONE

- **JOSEPH E. WARNER** OF 52 CHURCH GREEN, TAUNTON
  Present Attorney General. Candidate for Renomination

CONGRESSMAN — Eleventh District . . Vote for ONE

- **EDWARD LAWRENCE DONNELLY** OF 11 ALLSTON ST., BOSTON
  World War Veteran
- **WILLIAM F. McDONALD** OF 1 GEORGE STREET, CHELSEA

COUNCILLOR — Fourth District . . . Vote for ONE

SENATOR — First Suffolk District . . Vote for ONE

- **CONDE BRODBINE** OF 42 WASHBURN AVENUE, REVERE
  School Committee, Councilman, Representative, Senator

REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT
Twenty-fourth Suffolk District — **Vote for ONE**

- **WILLIAM J. FARRELL** OF 56 ELEANOR STREET, CHELSEA
- **FREDERICK C. HOLLAND** OF 85 GARFIELD AVENUE, CHELSEA
  Alderman-at-Large
- **JOHN W. MacLEOD** OF 17 JONES AVENUE, CHELSEA
  Alderman, 2 Terms, Representative, 2 Terms, Veteran

SHERIFF — Suffolk . . . . . Vote for ONE

- **EDGAR WARREN BIDWELL** OF 2010 DORCHESTER AVE., BOSTON
- **JOHN A. KELIHER** OF 239 CHARLES STREET, BOSTON
  Present Sheriff. Candidate for Renomination
- **JOHN A. MAY** OF 41 WELLESLEY PARK, BOSTON

CLERK SUPERIOR COURT — Suffolk County Vote for ONE
(Criminal Business) (To fill vacancy)

STATE COMMITTEE — First Suffolk District Vote for ONE

- **EDWARD E. SARGENT** OF 626 PLEASANT STREET, WINTHROP
- **G. WALLACE TIBBETTS** OF 100 GROVER AVENUE, WINTHROP
  For Re-election State Committee, Ex-Chairman Selectmen Winthrop

DELEGATES TO STATE CONVENTION

Vote for Individual Candidates by Cross against Names. Vote for Group by Cross in Circle. ◯

State Conv. Chelsea, Ward 4 — **Vote for TWO**

- **GEORGE W. KIMBALL** OF 75 BLOOMINGDALE STREET
- **SAM PAUL** OF 231 WALNUT STREET

WARD COMMITTEE

Vote for Individual Candidates by Cross against Names. Vote for Group by Cross in Circle. ◯

Ward Com. Chelsea, Ward 4 — **Vote for TEN**

- **SAM PAUL** OF 231 WALNUT STREET
- **LOUIS S. LEVENSON** OF 104 WASHINGTON AVENUE
- **SELBY HAWKINS** OF 79 ORANGE STREET
- **GEORGE WILLIAM KIMBALL** OF 75 BLOOMINGDALE STREET
- **FREEMAN A. PARSONS** OF 292 WASHINGTON AVENUE
- **ANNA BELLE KIMBALL** OF 75 BLOOMINGDALE STREET
- **FRANK D. HEISER** OF 70 BLOOMINGDALE STREET
- **ANNA PAUL** OF 231 WALNUT STREET

STATE PRIMARY

OFFICIAL BALLOT

OF THE

DEMOCRATIC PARTY

BOSTON

Ward 11

Precinct 9

Tuesday, September 20, 1932

Frederic W. Cook

SECRETARY OF THE COMMONWEALTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS

COPY

OFFICIAL BALLOT OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

TO VOTE FOR A PERSON MARK A CROSS |X| IN THE SQUARE AT THE RIGHT OF THE NAME.

GOVERNOR . . . . . Vote for ONE

- JDSEPH B. ELY OF 66 BROAD STREET, WESTFIELD
  Present Governor of the Commonwealth. For Renomination

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR . . . Vote for ONE

- EDWARD P. BARRY OF 32 SIGOURNEY STREET, BOSTON
  Lieutenant Governor 1914, Governor's Council, 1907-08-09
- DAVID J. BRICKLEY OF 296 TEMPLE STREET, BOSTON
  World War Veteran, Former Acting Mayor of Boston
- RAYMOND A. FITZGERALD OF 1 LEONARD AVENUE, CAMBRIDGE
  Present Member Cambridge School Committee, World War Veteran
- WILLIAM I. HENNESSEY OF 333 GENEVA AVENUE, BOSTON
  Representative 1921-1922, Senator Six Years 1923-1928
- FRANCIS E. KELLY OF 24 TOPLIFF STREET, BOSTON
  Boston City Council 1930-1931-1932
- JOHN F. MALLEY OF 188 COMMONWEALTH AVENUE, NEWTON
  Former Collector of Internal Revenue and State Senator
- MICHAEL C. O'NEILL OF 40 SUMMER STREET, EVERETT
  Mayor City of Everett
- JDHN E. SWIFT OF 7 PARKER HILL AVENUE, MILFORD

SECRETARY . . . . . Vote for ONE

- JDHN F. BUCKLEY OF 184 FULLER STREET, BOSTON
  State Senate 1929-1930
- J. EDWARD CALLANAN OF 197 TREMONT STREET, NEWTON
- JDHN W. CUSSEN OF 125 BROOK AVENUE, BOSTON
- ARTHUR G. FLYNN OF 8 BLANVON ROAD, BOSTON
- GEDRGE F. GILBODY OF 3 ELY ROAD, BOSTON
- GEORGE F. GROGAN OF 14 CENTRAL STREET, CONCORD
  Chairman Board of Assessors, Watertown 1911-1912-1913
- EDWARD J. GURRY OF 184 MAGAZINE STREET, CAMBRIDGE
  Former Member Great and General Court of Massachusetts
- JOHN D. O'BRIEN OF 68 DECATUR STREET, BOSTON
- JOSEPH SANTOSUOSSO OF 60 SCHOOL STREET, BOSTON
- RAY H. SHATTUCK OF 487 COLUMBIA ROAD, BOSTON
- CHARLES R. SULLIVAN OF 6 ADAMS STREET, BOSTON
- HENRY J. SULLIVAN OF 801 EAST THIRD STREET, BOSTON

TREASURER . . . . . Vote for ONE

- CHARLES F. HURLEY OF 57 FRESH POND LANE, CAMBRIDGE
  Present State Treasurer and Receiver General

AUDITOR . . . . . Vote for ONE

- JOHN E. BUCKLEY OF 2 CALIFORNIA AVENUE, QUINCY
- JDHN J. HARRINGTON OF 14 WOOD STREET, BOSTON
- FRANCIS X. HURLEY OF 106 INMAN STREET, CAMBRIDGE
  Present State Auditor. For Renomination
- ALFRED J. MODRE OF 61 SYCAMORE STREET, BOSTON
  Member of Legislature 3 Terms, World War Veteran
- LEO A. SPILLANE OF 18 ROSEWAY STREET, BOSTON
  World War Veteran

ATTORNEY GENERAL . . Vote for ONE

- JOHN P. BUCKLEY OF 48 CHESTNUT STREET, BOSTON
  Present Senate Democratic Leader, World War Veteran
- HARRY E. CASEY OF 837 THIRD STREET, BOSTON
- DANIEL J. DEMPSEY, Jr. OF 69 BARTLETT AVE., ARLINGTON
  World War Veteran
- WILLIAM R. SCHARTDN OF 10 FRANKLIN STREET, READING
- HARDLD W. SULLIVAN OF 30 KINROSS ROAD, BOSTON
  Former Assistant District Attorney, Boston
- RAYMOND E. SULLIVAN OF 1868 COMMONWEALTH AVE., BOSTON

CONGRESSMAN — Tenth District . . Vote for ONE

- JDHN J. CREHAN OF 48 WALLINGFORD ROAD, BOSTON
  World War Veteran

COUNCILLOR — Fourth District . . Vote for ONE

- RDBERT E. BIGNEY OF 531 EAST FOURTH STREET, BOSTON
  State Senator, Representative, and Member of Constitutional Convention
- DANIEL H. CDAKLEY OF 52 PARSONS STREET, BOSTON
- JDHN J. CDLLINS OF 1088 BENNINGTON STREET, BOSTON
- LED N. DDDLEY OF 111 VERNON STREET, BOSTON
- PATRICK J. FOLEY OF 505 BROADWAY, BOSTON
- DENNIS F. REARDON OF 1564 TREMONT STREET, BOSTON
  House of Representatives 1916-1917-1918-1919
- EDWARD M. SULLIVAN OF 5 LENOXDALE AVENUE, BOSTON
  Boston School Committee 1924-1930, World War Veteran

SENATOR — Fifth Suffolk District . . Vote for ONE

- JOHN J. CONNDRS OF 1551 COLUMBUS AVENUE, BOSTON
- MATTHEW W. COONEY OF 45 HILLSIDE STREET, BOSTON
- JDHN J. DALY OF 9 WESTERLY STREET, BOSTON
- JOHN J. KELLEHER OF 23 SCHILLER STREET, BOSTON
- THOMAS S. KENNEDY OF 154 PARKER HILL AVENUE, BOSTON
  House of Representatives 8 Years 1925 to 1932
- WILLIAM F. MADDEN OF 76 FOREST HILLS STREET, BOSTON
  Representative 1925-1926-1931-1932
- JDHN F. TIRRELL, Jr. OF 7 PERKINS SQUARE, BOSTON

REPRESENTATIVES IN GENERAL COURT

Eleventh Suffolk District — Vote for TWO

- EUGENE M. BRDWN OF 12 SPAULDING STREET, BOSTON
- THDMAS H. CARR OF 15 DALRYMPLE STREET, BOSTON
  Representative 1927-1930
- JDHN F. CULLEN OF 274 ARBORWAY, BOSTON
- PATRICK J. GRIFFIN OF 63 LAMBERT AVENUE, BOSTON
- WILLIAM F. HIGGINS OF 42 FOREST HILLS CIRCLE, BOSTON
- GEDRGE H. KELLEY OF 15 BAINBRIDGE STREET, BOSTON
- JAMES J. KILRDY OF 100 CENTRE STREET, BOSTON
- TIMDTHY J. McDONOUGH OF 131 CAROLINA AVENUE, BOSTON
  Present Representative. For Renomination
- CHARLES L. D'REILLY OF 82 WEST WALNUT PARK, BOSTON
- THOMAS L. QUILTY OF 15 ROSEMARY STREET, BOSTON
- DANIEL J. SULLIVAN, Jr. OF 75 CAROLINA AVENUE, BOSTON
- JOSEPH L. TRAINOR OF 29 BAINBRIDGE STREET, BOSTON

SHERIFF — Suffolk . . . . . Vote for ONE

- JOHN F. DDWD OF 22 GREENVILLE STREET, BOSTON
  Present Member of Boston City Council
- JDHN A. KELIHER OF 239 CHARLES STREET, BOSTON
  Present Sheriff. Candidate for Renomination
- JDSEPH V. LYDNS OF 666 COLUMBIA ROAD, BOSTON
  Boston School Committee 1928-29-30-31
- MICHAEL W. OBER OF 80 KING STREET, BOSTON

CLERK SUPERIOR COURT — Suffolk County Vote for ONE

(Criminal Business) (To fill vacancy)

- WILLIAM C. S. HEALEY OF 183 WEBSTER STREET, BOSTON
  City Councillor, State Representative
- DANIEL A. McLAUGHLIN OF 2 COMMON STREET, BOSTON
- JAMES J. MULVEY OF 46 COBDEN STREET, BOSTON
  Representative 1919-1922, Massachusetts Senate 1923-1928
- WILLIAM MICHAEL PRENDIBLE OF 24 CHAMBERS ST., BOSTON
  Present Clerk. Candidate for Nomination

STATE COMMITTEE — Fifth Suffolk District Vote for ONE

- SILAS F. TAYLOR OF 28 WARWICK STREET, BOSTON
- MAURICE J. TDBIN OF 107 CALUMET STREET, BOSTON

DELEGATES TO STATE CONVENTION

Vote for Individual Candidates by Cross against Names. Vote for Group by Cross in Circle.

State Conv. Boston, Ward 11 — Vote for TWENTY

- DANIEL J. CARROLL OF 62 ST. ROSE STREET
- EDWARD M. O'ROURKE OF 2751 WASHINGTON STREET
- CHARLES F. McMDRROW OF 70 TOWER STREET
- MARK H. LYNCH, Jr. OF 106 SCHOOL STREET
- JOHN J. RYAN OF 85 GLEN ROAD
- JOHN T. GLENNON OF 36 HALL STREET
- FRANK H. FLYNN OF 36 MARCELLA STREET
- THDMAS M. CREEGAN OF 4 PETER PARLEY ROAD
- JAMES F. DOLAN OF 212 BOYLSTON STREET
- JAMES J. HANABURY OF 18 ST. ROSE STREET
- FRANCIS J. McCANN OF 14 WALNUT PARK
- HERBERT R. SANFDRD OF 172 BOYLSTON STREET
- ALEXANDER W. MacDDNALD OF 8 GERMANIA STREET
- HERBERT DUGGAN OF 85 GLEN ROAD
- WILLIAM LEE OF 2 MARBURY TERRACE
- AUGUSTINE P. FAY OF 1 BOYLSTON PLACE
- RICHARD J. SULLIVAN OF 20 ST. ROSE STREET
- EDWARD J. SWEENEY OF 18 IFFLEY ROAD
- RDBERT G. CAMERDN OF 172 BOYLSTON STREET
- THOMAS E. CHARLTON OF 8 GERMANIA STREET

WARD COMMITTEE

Vote for Individual Candidates by Cross against Names. Vote for Group by Cross in Circle.

Vote for SIXTEEN

Ward Com. Boston, Ward 11 — Group 1

- WILLIAM CDSTELLD OF 44 BOYNTON STREET
- JAMES J. CUMMINGS OF 16 BEETHOVEN STREET
- JOSEPH L. McBIRNEY OF 18 ATHERTON STREET
- JDSEPH GRAGLIA OF 5 DENNISON STREET
- FRANK GILMORE OF 44 BOYNTON STREET
- WILLIAM FRANK OF 104 SCHOOL STREET
- GEORGE H. LAMBERT OF 1905 COLUMBUS AVENUE
- JAMES P. REILLY OF 34 COBDEN STREET
- GEORGE T. SNYDER OF 29 COBDEN STREET
- JDHN M. O'REILLY OF 56 BRAGDON STREET
- RICHARD COUGHLAN OF 59 ATHERTON STREET
- JDSEPH F. SHIELDS OF 19 PLAINFIELD STREET
- FRANCIS C. SNYDER OF 29 COBDEN STREET

Ward Com. Boston, Ward 11 — Group 2

- DANIEL J. CARRDLL OF 62 ST. ROSE STREET
- EDWARD M. D'ROURKE OF 2751 WASHINGTON STREET
- CHARLES F. McMDRROW OF 70 TOWER STREET
- MARK H. LYNCH, Jr. OF 106 SCHOOL STREET
- JOHN J. RYAN OF 85 GLEN ROAD
- JDHN T. GLENNON, Jr. OF 36 HALL STREET
- FRANK H. FLYNN OF 36 MARCELLA STREET
- THDMAS M. CREEGAN OF 4 PETER PARLEY ROAD
- JAMES F. DDLAN OF 212 BOYLSTON STREET
- JAMES J. HANABURY OF 18 ST. ROSE STREET
- FRANCIS J. McCANN OF 14 WALNUT PARK
- HERBERT R. SANFDRD OF 172 BOYLSTON STREET
- ALEXANDER W. MacDDNALD OF 8 GERMANIA STREET
- HERBERT DUGGAN OF 85 GLEN ROAD
- WILLIAM LEE OF 2 MARBURY TERRACE
- AUGUSTINE P. FAY OF 1 BOYLSTON PLACE

Ward Com. Boston, Ward 11 — Group 3

- JOHN J. PISCITELLI OF 183 CENTRE STREET

Chapter IV

THE OPERATION OF THE PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY

A. Presidential Nomination by Legislative Resolution and by Elected Delegates.

In the early times, that is, previous to 1824, presidential nominations were ade by a congressional caucus. In 1828 there was, however, a revolt from the system spoken of above and the Presidential nominations at this time were made in four ways: nomination b Legislative, Resolution, nominations by State Legislative Caucus, nominations by Mixed Conventions, and nomination by State Conventions.

It is with the mixed convention method of nomination that we first hear of anything of special nature in relation to Massachusetts presidential nominations. This was the method used in the nominations of John Quincy Adams in January, 1823, at "a joint meeting of the Republican members of the Massachusetts legislation and of Republican delegates from the various towns of the commonwealth not represented in the legislature".[1] From this excerpt it can be gathered that the "mixed convention" was composed of the party members of the legislature, together with delegates from those counties or towns not represented in the legislature, by members belonging to the party holding the Convention. Then, Massachusetts turned to the State Legislature

---

1. Dallinger Nominations for Elective Office page 33

in 1836 to nominate Daniel Webster.[2]

These early methods of nomination finally gave way to the Presidential Primary. Massachusetts adopted the Oregon idea early in 1912. This idea provided for a preference vote for President and Vice-president, as well as the direct election of all convention delegates. The Progressive wing of the Republican party was really responsible for the adoption of the direct election method for they felt that under the Convention system (wherein the delegates were chosen previous to 1912) the "old guard" would control the State convention and thus control the delegates at the National Convention. These Progressives thought that the direct election of delegates by the voters might result differently.

B. Preferential Voting.

Massachusetts requires that delegates' names must be proposed by petitions. This State also required for a time that candidates for delegates must have personal preference stated on the Primary ballot, the idea being that the voters would then select these delegates whose personal preferences agree with their own. This idea did not prove practical, however, for in the Massachusetts Primaries of 1912, there was a close race between Taft and Roosevelt, and in the final return the Republicans endorsed Taft but gave eight delegates to Roosevelt. This laughable

---

2. Dallinger Nominations for Elective Office page 40

mix-up was even more ludicrous in the Democratic Primary where Clark carried the preference vote against Wilson, yet all of the delegates at-large has pressed a preference for Governor Foss (who had withdrawn his name as a candidate for the preferential vote.)

After this farcical incident, the preferential vote was eliminated. The law provides that candidates for delegates may be grouped under the names of the candidates whom they prefer for President, thus placing the rightful emphasis on the Presidential candidate rather than on the delegate.

Massachusetts, unlike most other States, makes no provision for the casting of one vote for a group of delegates but the laws do give advantage to groups which are complete by giving them top position upon the ballot. "No preference" delegates have the same right to appear in groups as have those groups giving a preference. This last provision seems to have brought about a curious twist in Massachusetts politics, for delegates have shown a disinclination to announce their preference. This happened in 1920 when Republican organization filed a Collidge slate as no preference. The ballot itself clearly brings out the relationship between the delegates who have the same preference for president, so that there is no excuse for the average voter not knowing whom he is voting for.

C. Party Enrollment.

Massachusetts does require voting by party application. Voters must be enrolled by the party at the time of registration, and they may vote only in the Primary of the party in which they are enrolled. Thus the Presidential Primary is closed in the same manner of the State Primary.

D. Objection to Uninstructed Delegates.

The great objection to the uninstructed delegate is, of course, that it helps political manipulation, particularly in a State like Massachusetts where party organizations are strong. The party slate cannot be pinned down to the responsibility of voting for the person the people desire. There were uninstructed delegates both in 1916 and 1920. This bad feature of Massachusetts' legislation ought to be corrected if there is to be an expression of popular opinion in the Presidential Primary.

Still another queer feature in Massachusetts politics is that in spite of the fact that the State committee is the organization of the party as a whole and might be expected to remain neutral in Primary struggles, it usually not only suggests lists of delegates but throws the whole weight of the organization to one presidential candidate or another. An example of this conduct was in the campaign of 1912 wherein the Republican State committee

supported Taft against Roosevelt.

E. Synopsis of Massachusetts Primary Laws.

The writer is indebted to Miss Louise Overacker for the following synopsis of the Massachusetts Primary Laws.[3]

Digest of Massachusetts Presidential Primary Laws 214-215.

Massachusetts Compiled Laws, 1921-Chapter 53, Sections 7,23,40,44, 46, 65, 70: Acts of 1912-Chapter 254; Acts 1913-Chapter 835, Sections 138,158. General Acts 1916-Chapter 16.

Date: Last Tuesday in May (no other election at that time).

How Names Are Put on Ballot: Delegates at-large, petition signed by 1,000 voters not less than 250 of whom come from each of four different counties.

District delegate, five voters from each ward or town in the district, but never more than 250.

Nomination papers must be filed on or before the fifth Tuesday preceding the election.

For Whom A Vote is Cast: Delegates at-large, District delegates.

Method of Control: Ballot contains a statement of the Presidential preference, if any, of each candi-

---

3. Overacker The Presidential Primary

date for delegate provided that such candidate for nomination files his written assent thereto. Delegates preferring a certain candidate for President may be grouped together, but must be voted for separately.

Who May Vote: Voters must vote with party in which enrolled, but they may change or cancel their enrollment by appearing in person before the town clerk and registering again in writing. The change takes effect in thirty days.

The Presidential Primary, while having fair success, is not the true democratic method for voting for a nominee for the Presidency. In State Primary elections, the people are using the direct method and have found it successful. The indirect method is out of date and should be done away with. Massachusetts has lagged behind the other States in election reform, and this is her chance to once more take the lead that was hers in colonial times and advocate Direct Primary election of Presidential candidates. Taking it out of the hands of a convention where trading and bickering are paramount and giving to the people the direct choice of Presidential nominees, would be the greatest step in the purification of elections since the advent of the direct slate Primary.

Chapter V

THE CHANGES THAT HAVE BEEN ADVOCATED FOR THE IMPROVEMENT IF DIRECT PRIMARY IN MASSACHUSETTS

A. Recommendations for Reform of Direct Primary in Massachusetts.

The Direct Primary system is not a God-given devise that has no faults whatsoever. It has its failings as well as its advantages. From the time of its introduction in 1911, various reforms have been advocated.

Frank J. Donahue, Secretary of State, in his report on elections gave the following recommendations of the Primary: (Boston January 29, 1914)[1]

"First: the abolition of party enrollment at Primaries and the substitution of a single ballot with party colums for the individual party ballot.

Second: that the numer of members of ward and town committees and delegates to be elected at the Primaries be limited.

Third: an incumbent of a State officer may have his name printed upon the Primary ballot of the party which he represents as a candidate for such office

---

1. Public Document 43, 1914

upon a request in writing filed with the Secretary of the Commonwealth on or before the last hour for filing Primary nomination papers.

Fourth: that no person whose name is not printed on the Primary ballot as a candidate for an office shall be deemed to be nominated as a candidate for such office, unless at the Primary he shall hve received a number of votes equal to the number required to nominate him as a candidate for such office to be voted for at a Primary".

Although Mr. Donahue's suggestions were never acted upon, they nevertheless give an insight to some of the changes desired in this period.

During the war there was little agitation for changes in the Primary as the people were too busy with more important things.

In the Legislative sedsion of 1921 there were two bills introduced, one providing for the nomination of minor offices by convention, and another for endorsement of candidates by pre-primary convention. The old convention adherents and party "bosses" were still alive and desirous for the "old regime". These bills did not get anywhere, but the pre-primary convention bill will be heard of again, for it becomes a leading issue in 1927. In 1922 and 1925, various bills were introduced, but in 1927 five bills were introduced on the Direct Primary. They included

one by the chairman of the State Republican Committee, and one by the chairman of the Democratic State Committee, both providing for the pre-primary convention. The two party organizations for once seemed to be in entire accord on the desirability of such a step. Their power was waning.

They felt there was a need for some act to get control of elections again. There were, however, disappointed for finally the Committee on Elections reported a substitute measure providing for a pre-primary convention and adding a party Primary in non-presidential general election years for the election of members of the State committee and delegates to the State convention. In Presidential years, this Primary would have coincided with the present presidential Primary.[2] The bill was referred to a recess committee which did not recommend the pre-primary convention, but proposed a return to the convention method of nominating Secretary of State, Treasurer, Auditor, and Attorney-General. (the majority of the committee itself was in favor of pre-primary convention bill, but decided it would be impossible to pass it through the Legislature because people were not educated to it.)[3]

B. Pre-primary Convention.

A pre-primary convention is one held to endorse candidates for offices to be filled by all the voters, and

---

3. Bulletin of the Massachusetts League of Voters Apr., May, 1927
3. Report of the Joint Special Committee on the Administrative Operation of Election Laws December 1927

these endorsed candidates are voted upon at the State Primaries. In 1927, the bill for the pre-primaries convention was met with strong opposition as well as with organized promotion. Miss Florence H. Luscomb opposed it and stated her arguments in a leaflet (issued by the Legislative Council), while Francis Prescott championed it giving the arguments as follows:

"In any discussion of the Primary it must be remembered that it is a meeting of a party organization for the purposes of choosing offices and representatives of the party, and concerns members of the party only---Political parties are no different than my other political, civic, or social organization which members join to further a common interest. But in any other such organization preceding the meeting for the choice of officers, it is customary to choose a nominating committee to consider the qualifications of the candidates and endorse those best qualified in their judgment----It has always been difficult to interest the voter to go to the polls on election day. At the Primary, still greater difficulty is encountered---It is generally conceded that the position of the name of a candidate on the ballot has a very decided bearing on his vote because of failure to properly consider his other qualifications---It is so called a pre-primary convention plan as it retains the Primary of the nominations of candidates as at present without

any curtailment of the right of every voter to nominate or be nominated as at present-------Under this proposal candidates endorsed by the convention would undoubtedly have an advantage over the other candidates, but only because the individual voter had confidence in the decision of the convention and wished to accept that endorsement---That pre-primary convention, combining the convention as a nominating committee with its Primary as its meeting for the choice of party representatives, is not and cannot be likened to the old convention from whose decisions there was no appeal.

Miss Luscomb's argument against the pre-primary convention idea is the following:

"The measure proposes essentially a return to the convention system of nominations. Its advocates deny that they are attacking the Primary, because the voters would still go through the motions of a Primary in September. But what virtue remains in that Primary if some three months previous a party convention has named a slate, which has all the prestige of being an official, and behind which, during those three months, there have been lined up every ward and precinct and town committee, every party newspaper, and every financial backer?-----Does a convention nomination give us as claimed, "party responsibility"? Will anyone suggest the Democratic National Convention of 1924 as a demonstration of party responsibility? Or was the choice of the Republican presidential candidate of 1920 by a hand-

ful of men in a hotel bedroom in the wee small hours of the night a more edifying example of "party responsibility"? -----How is this convention, which is to remedy the evils of the Primary to be created? By holding an additional Primary? Because one Primary has imperfections, we are to substitute two Primaries and one convention---The convention rather than the Primary is another failure because of the small vote it brings out. The Direct Primary has increased public interest in nominations four-fold, seven-fold, often even ten-fold,--an amazing success.

Let us study proposed improvements of the Primary-----short ballot, rotating ballots to remove the alphabetical advantage,---Let us go forward, not back to conventions which was tried and found wanting."[4]

Miss Luscomb's argument is much the stronger, although it did not lance the "party" man in his fight for power. The bill defeated in 1927 came back even stronger in 1932.

The Springfield Republican speaking of the pre-primary convention bill says "With five Democrats dissenting its Committee on Election Laws today voted to report the initiative petition for the establishment of pre-primary conventions of political parties. The bill provides that the convention be held prior to Primaries when

---

4. Collections of F. H. Luscomb

candidates for the State ticket would be endorsed and so appear on the party ballot. Representative Roland D. Sawyer of Ware is the only Democrat to sign the majority report of the committee". [5]

Again the Springfield Republican remarks "That short difference of opinion as to the advisability of passing such legislation prevented Republican members of the Senate in caucus today from voting on its so called pre-primary convention bill. A caucus was called to draw the measure, which is to be acted upon tomorrow, and was intended to line up the entire Republican delegation in support of a favorable report of the Election Laws Committee. Discussion lasted more than an hour, and members who were present declared there was a lack of unanimity on the matter."[6]

The pre-primary bill passed the Senate by a roll call vote of 21 to 17. Senator Joseph W. Monahan of Belmont said the pre-primary would result in hand-picked candidates. He also said that Coolidge owed all to the Direct Primary.[7]

The bill, however, failed to pass the roll call vote of 62-138. Representative McCarthy said "No law should be passed taking away the constitutional right of citizens to select their own candidates." [8] As a result, the sponsors of the petition had to obtain 5,000 more signatures, which

---

6. Springfield Republican May 9, 1932
7. Springfield Republican May 10, 1932
8. Springfield Republican May 11, 1932

they did, and the bill came before the people on November 8, 1932, and was passed by the people.

The principal provisions of the bill are as follows:

Time: Convention to be held not later than June 15--delegates to be elected to convention by party Primaries to be held on last Tuesday of April.

Name of Endorsed Candidates on Ballot: Name of endorsed candidate placed on ballot automatically and in the first place on the ballot with words "endorsed by (the name of the political party) convention" in addition to eight words in a statement now authorized by law.

Election of district members of State committees and members of ward and the town committees at proposed party Primaries in April.

Election of delegates to National Convention at proposed party Primaries.

The time for notice to the State Secretary by aldermen or selectmen of their determination to hold Primaries by ward, precinct, or groups of precincts to March first instead of August first.

Names of candidates for election of delegates to a State convention and for district members of a

State committee to be arranged individually by alphabet instead of in groups arranged by lot, as now.[9]

These are the principal provisions of the act whcih goes into effect at the next State Primary election.

The State of Massachusetts now has its pre-primary convention system which it is to be feared will lead to more evils than advantages. This will be further discussed in the concluding chapter.

C. Other Proposals for Change.

Representative Henry D. Sisson of Pittsfield proposed a law for the return to the political convention. He declared that the Primary no longer expresses public opinion.[10] This bill (H-89) was given leave to withdraw.

A petition of Robert M. Washburn of the Roosevelt Club Inc. for the abolition of Primary elections for nominations to State offices and to re-establish the political convention system was presented. The Women League of Voters opposed this bill. The bill (H-205) was given leave to withdraw.

While there have been sundry bills offered to radically change the Direct Primary system used in Massachusetts, the only one that had success was the pre-primary convention bill. This bill is a substitute for actual repeal of the Direct Primary and the author prefers to believe that it was through lack of education on the peoples' part to pass such a law.

9. Official Information to Voters 1932
10. Springfield Republican March 1, 1932

The nominating systems of Massachusetts have been traced up to the present day. What will be its fate in the future? What pitfalls should be avoided? The concluding chapter will discuss the evils of the Direct Primary system and the political trends.

Chapter VI

CONCLUSION

Much time has been spent in portraying the operation of the various moninating systems. In this final chapter, the importance of the Primary will be stressed, the evils discussed, criticisms stated, and the remedies given as far as possible.

A. Importance of the Primary.

Frank R. Kent says of the importance of the Primaries: "To think that the general election is more important than the Primary election, as most voters do, is to magnify the wrong side of the political picture. It ought to be reversed and instead of, as now, many more voters voting in the general election than in the Primaries, the public interest should be concentrated on the Primaries first--------Primaries are really the key to politics. There is no way for party candidates to get on the general election ballot except through the Primaries. Primaries are the exclusive gate through which all party candidates must pass. Control of that gate in any community means control of the political situation in that community---- The only place a machine can be beaten is in the Primaries -------The fact that I wish to drive home now is that all over the country ninety-nine out of a hundred candidates

for all offices are nominated on a result of Primaries." [1] From such a statement comes the valid reason of writing a work on the subject of Massachusetts Primary system.

B. The Evils of the Primary System.

As to the evils of the Direct Primary it is alleged that the Primary weakens party responsibility. This accusation can hardly be laid at the door of the Direct Primary, but rather at the party's door because they have become meaningless, insincere, and instrumental in the advancement of a few people. It must be admitted by even the most violent critic of the Primary that the party organizationshhave a good deal of influence upon the choice of Primary candidates.[2]

It is also said that the Primaries produce inferior candidates. Those who offer this criticism of the Primary as sufficient evidence of its failure forget that the chief purpose of the Direct Primaries was not to increase the efficiency of the government; it was to insure that whatever the government was--whether good or bad--the voters should have their will about it and not have to accept a government at the hands of a party organization.

That Primary places too great a burden on the voter is true, but the answer is the enactment of the short ballot system and not a return to a nominating system which

1. Kent The Great Game of Politics pages 6-8
2. Rocca Nominating Methods page 40

discredited itself because of its representative character.

The allegation that the Primary is too expensive is answered very well by Representative Robert Luce, thirteenth Massachusetts district, who says: "The present method is far less expensive than that which it superceded. I know, for I have run for high office under both methods. Let it be clearly understood that whenever a candidate has to appeal to all voters in his party, it is cheaper to do this under the Primary election system than under the convention system".[3]

It is claimed that the Primary fails to bring out a large vote. This statement is false when the returns at the Primary are compared with those of the convention. Very seldom did more than ten per cent come out to choose delegates for the convention, but from twenty-five to seventy-five per cent of the party voters, and even as high as fifty to eighty per cent when the competition is keen come out to choose candidates in the Direct Primary. "Even though the highest figure given be taken for the convention vote and the lowest one for the Primary there is still a margin of fifteen per cent in favor of the Primaries, so far as representation of the party voters is concerned. And it must be remembered that the convention chosen candidate is twice removed from the voter." [4]

---

3. Collections of F. H. Luscomb
4. Rocca Nominating Methods pages 47-48

Beveridge says: "-----from five to ten times as many party voters get to the polls a Primary day as the number who used to vote for convention delegates".[5] These quotations are the answer to the indictment that not enough voters come out for Primaries. The Direct Primary seems to be the best system yet used for nominating. The evils of the old convention system are far too great to advocate a return to it. It is to be regretted that Massachusetts has seen fit to adopt a pre-primary convention which is a close return to the convention system and its evils. Miss Luscomb in an interview with its author said:[6] "It destroys the Direct Primary as the convention is held three months ahead of the Primary, and thus the party can organize behind a list of candidates and almost invariably will have them nominated at the Primary." Kent points out in his book, The Great Game of Politics, that ten persons on an average are receiving favors and they, with their friends, constitute a solid block for the party to start in the Primary with. The pre-primary convention is a substitute for the old convention when the party leaders saw that there was no chance of getting the repeal of the Direct Primary. We shall have the evils of the old convention system back again. I, myself, favor proportional representation and the short ballot and the elimination of the

---

5. Beveridge Of, By, and For the People-Yes or No? pp.51-2
6. Used with Miss Luscomb's permission

Primary altogether.

C. The Special Merits of the Primaries.

1. It places a weapon in the hands of the party voters which they can use with effect in case of need. They are no longer helpless.

2. The fact of this control gives to the voters a consciousness of power and responsibility.

With these merits, A. Lawrence Lowell disagrees, pointing out that "the party itslef is so large a body that some one must present the candidate for nomination to its members. Even if all the Republican voters in a State could come together in a mass meeting, a name to be discussed and voted upon would have to be proposed by some one, and this is certainly not less true when the members of the party never meet together but cast their ballots singly in polling booths. Moreover, to propose a name to all the party voters in a large community is not a simple matter. It is not enough to collect the number of signatures required to entitle the name to appear on the ballot. That is laborious; but to have any chance of success, the candidate and his qualifications must be made known to the voters, and that envolves an organization with branches throughout the community. The Direct Primary intensifies the practice which had already begun to prevail under the convention system of conducting an elaborate canvass for nomination------It is by no means yet proved that the Direct

Primary is the road to the promised land." [7]

The author, in disagreement with the above quotation, has come to the conclusion through his study that the Direct Primary system is the best method of nomination. But let it be pointed out that the Primary, accompanied by the long ballot, by the spoils system in State government, by ineffective leadership, and by staggering campaing expenditures is not likely to stand. There must be a shortening of the ballot, less political "grab-bagging" and an extension of the merit system.

D. Summary.

As a concluding statement on the Direct Primary system as used by Massachusetts, it must be remembered that: "The Direct Primary system represents simply a stage in the progressive adjustment of political mechanisms to the changing needs of our developing civilization. In such an evolutionary process there is rarely a sharp turn backward, as a return to the convention would be. When the Primary has had its day, some new and more highly refined mechanism for registering political opinion will capture the fancy of the electorate; perhaps non-partisan nominations, perhaps proportional representation, perhaps a device yet undreamed of. There is no need to despair of the future of our civic society, if only the citizen will vigorously participate in its activities, using the intelligence that he possesses and the

7. Rocca Nominating Methods page 55

knowledge that can be imparted to him by sound political education.

THE END

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Title: Nominations for Elective Office.

Author: Frederick W. Dallinger.

Publisher: Harvard University Press.

Place: Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Date: 1897.

This work is particularly good for the history and evolution of the Primary system in Massachusetts. This book is well written and authoritative, taking the place in the preferred volumes in this bibliography.

Title: The Presidential Primary.

Author: Louise Overacker.

Publisher: The MacMillan Co.

Place: New York City, New York.

Date: 1926.

This work written by an eminent authority in the field of government, Miss Overacker's book is undoubtedly the best on the subject of the title. Complete with numerous references, it is a preferred work.

Title: Primary Elections and Direct Nominations.

Author: A pamphlet issued by the Caucus Reform League.

Publishers: Compiled by the Press Clipping Bureau.

Date: 1902.

This small pamphlet gives interesting quotations of public opinion in Massachusetts and elsewhere, as voiced by one hundred and thirty editors, eight governors, and others with regard to the introduction of the Direct Primary system.

Title: Primary Elections.

Author: C. E. Merriam.

Publisher: University of Chicago Press.

Place: Chicago, Illinois.

Date; 1908.

The work is dimmed by the more up-to-date volume, in which the author collaborated with Louise Overacker.

Title: Public Opinion and Popular Government.

Author: A. Lawrence Lowell.

Publisher: Longman's, Green & Co.

Date: 1913.

The work is valuable in that the opinions expressed are logical and to the point.

Title: The Direct Primary.

Author: Articles compiled by L. T. Berman.

Publisher: H. W. Wilson Co.

Place: New York.

Date: 1926.

This compilation worthy of study for a debate on

the Direct Primary, but not for research.

Title: The School of Politics.

Author: E. Hofer.

Publisher: Charles H. Kerr & Co.

Place: Chicago.

Date: 1896.

This book was neither very interesting nor informative upon the subject at hand.

Title: National Conference on Practical Reform of Primary Elections. Held at the Rooms of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, 203 Broadway, mNew York City.

Date: Thursday and Friday, January 20 and 21, 1898.

This record of the minutes of the Conference gave an interesting sidelight upon the opinion of the Massachusetts officials with regard to the introduction of the Direct Primary system in Massachusetts.

Title: Primary Elections:

Author: C. E. Merriam and L. Overacker.

Publisher: University of Chicago Press.

Date: 1928.

Written by two such distinguished authors, this book is a preferred on on the subject on Primaries.

Title: The American Party System.

Author: E. C. Merriam and H. F. Goswell.

Publisher: MacMillan Co.

Place: New York.

Date:1930

This work of little value for my subject.

Title: A Brief History of the Constitution Government of Massachusetts.

Author: Louis Adams Frothingham

Publisher: Houghton, Mifflin Co.

Place: Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Date: 1925.

Very little information in this work in regard to the Primary.

Title: The Massachusetts Constitutional Convention of 1917.

Author: Raymond R. Bridgman.

Publisher: Published by the Author.

Place: Boston.

Date: 1923.

This volume contained little of worthwhile note for my subject.

Title: Nominating Methods.

Author: Helen M. Rocca.

Publisher: National League of Women Voters.

Place: Washington, D. C.

Date: 1927.

This pamphlet was exceptionally good in its treatment of

the Direct Primary, and was extremely helpful.

Title: The Great Game of Politics.

Author: Frank R. Kent.

Publisher: Doubleday, Page & Co.

Place: New York.

Date: 1924.

For a real good and interesting discussion on American politics, this book by far outshone any other work I came across in my search for material.

Title: Of, By, and For the People--Yes or No?

Author: Albert J. Beveridge.

Publisher: Curtis Publishing Co.

Place: Cambridge, Mass.

Date: 1927.

This pamphlet contained an excellent indictment of the convention system of Nomination.

Title: The Meaning and Importance of Nomination Reform.

Author: Horace E. Deming:

Publisher: National Numicipal League Pamphlet No. 9.

Place: Philadelphia, Pa.

Date: 1903.

This pamphlet proved of no real value.

Title: Nominating Systems.

Author: E. C. Meyer.

Publisher: Published by Author.

Place: Madison, Wis.

Date: 1902.

This work is excellent for the years between 1888-1902.

Many sundry pamphlets and clippings from either Miss Luscomb's collection or in the libraries.

Public Document 43.

Bulletin of the Massachusetts League of Voters.

Report of the Joint Special Committee on the Administrative Operation of the Election Laws.

Collection of Florence H. Luscomb.

Springfield Republican clippings

Official Information to Voters issued for the November 8, 1932 election.

General Laws of Massachusetts 1932 election.

Compiled Laws of Massachusetts.

Acts and Resolutions of Massachusetts.

Date Due

DO NOT REMOVE
CHARGE SLIP FROM THIS POCKET
IF SLIP IS LOST PLEASE RETURN BOOK
DIRECTLY TO A CIRCULATION STAFF MEMBER

BOSTON UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
771 Commonwealth Ave.
Boston, Mass. 02215

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
1 1719 02576 8807

ACCO PRODUCTS BINDER
Made in U.S.A.
ACCO PRODUCTS, INC.